

CANCELLATION OF DOLLAR
AMOUNT OF DISCRETIONARY
BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-
147)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel the dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998" (Public Law 105-45; H.R. 2016). I have determined that the cancellation of these amounts will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 6, 1997.

NATIONAL MONUMENT FAIRNESS
ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 256 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1127.

□ 1842

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1127) to amend the Antiquities Act to require an act of Congress and the concurrence of the Governor and State legislature for the establishment by the President of national monuments in excess of 5,000 acres, with Mr. SNOWBARGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting bill that we have in front of us at this time. It is a fairness act, is what it is.

On September 18, 1996, the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, stood on the south rim of the Grand Canyon and declared 1.7 million

acres of land as a national monument in the State of Utah. What did he do this under? He did this under the 1906 antiquities law.

Does he have the right to do it? You bet he does. He has the right to do that. President Carter earlier had done a similar piece of legislation in Alaska of around 53 million acres.

□ 1845

Why is this bill around? Because in 1906 the President of the United States had no way to protect the gorgeous parts of America that should be protected. Wisely, Teddy Roosevelt could see a reason to do it, and out of that we got the Grand Canyon, we got Zion, we got some beautiful areas. All of those should be protected.

Later on, in 1915, we got a park bill. That park bill is what President Roosevelt probably would have used, but he did not have anything. There was nothing to protect it. Later on, Congress passed the 1964 Wilderness Act. Later on, in 1969, they passed the NEPA Act. In 1976, they passed the bill called FLPMA, or Federal Land Policy Management Act. And besides that there was the Wild Washington Trail Act, there is the Scenic Rivers Act, and the list goes on and on.

So Teddy Roosevelt did not have a tool to use. He did not have a way to do it so he used this. Since that time, other Presidents have used it and we now have 73 national monuments.

Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to say that the majority of people in here could tell me what was a distinguishing feature of the Golden Spike National Monument. They would say, of course, what it is is where the two trains came together. How about the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, where we see that beautiful red arch? Everyone could distinguish that one. So we say, well, what did we do on this one; what is the distinguishing feature? He talked about archeology, but he did not distinguish it. He talked about geology, but he did not tell us what it was. But we have 1.7 million acres.

Now let us go back to the law, where we put our hands in the air and took an oath that we would obey the law. That is the next thing; is that he would use the smallest acreage possible to do it. Smallest acreage to preserve what? What did we come up with to preserve 1.7 million acres?

To give my colleagues an idea of 1.7 million acres, that is pretty big. We could take Delaware and two other States and put it in that and they would become a national monument.

The bill we have in front of us says, well, if we are really mad at the President, as some of our colleagues say, if we are vindictive, if we want revenge, if we want to get even, let us repeal the law. I hope we rise above that. I hope we are bigger than that. I hope we should say this should still be on the books.

So we said what would be a reasonable amount of acreage for the Presi-

dent, and we came up with the figure 50,000 acres. Can people in this room equate with 50,000 acres? I will give them a hint. How big is Washington, DC? Anybody in here know? How about 39,000 acres. So all of Washington, DC is only 39,000 acres.

So we are saying we are going to give the President 50,000 acres; he can do it wherever, whenever he wants. He can put it in San Francisco, he can put it in New York, he can put it in Minnesota, which I would suggest three great places there. Anyway, carrying that on, we are giving him 50,000 acres.

Let us say the President says he wants more than that; he wants a bigger piece. This bill says the President now has to talk for 30 days with the Governor of the State and confer with him. But if he wants more than that, all he has to do is come to Congress. So this bill takes care of it.

We are not hurting any environment. In fact, it would be a very interesting debate that I would look forward to entering into, saying what does the antiquities bill protect. I have the bill in my hands here. It protects nothing.

In fact, if my colleagues do not believe that, go down to southern Utah and look at the people going there in hordes looking for something to see. When I stand out there as a Federal official and they say, where is the monument? I say, "Friend, you are standing in it." They say, "Well, what am I supposed to see?" I say, "I don't know, look around and enjoy it."

People say, well, we got rid of that coal mine before it protected anything. I would be willing to ask anybody in the 435, who has been to that coal mine other than me? I have been there a number of times. If my colleagues have not been there, if they want to see one of the ugliest places in the State of Utah, they should go stand at Smokey Hollow. Rolling hills of sagebrush and bugs and nothing else. And if anybody wants to stand up and say that is beautiful, I would certainly question it.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what are we trying to do? This has nothing to do with the environment because it protects nothing. It has nothing to do with wilderness. Some of my colleagues have said, oh, the President did this because we did not pass the wilderness bill. Come on, get real.

Let us go back to the things we took from the President and the Department of Interior. All of the correspondence, not one shred of it, not one scintilla, says anything about protecting, except Mrs. Katy McGinty, who says one other thing, she says, "There is nothing here worth preserving." Right in her own words. So protection is not an issue, wilderness is not an issue, parks are not an issue.

In fact, if wilderness was the issue, I sometimes wonder, when my friends on the other side of the aisle were in control, why they did not allow the Wayne Owens bill of 5.4 million acres. Did not even allow a hearing on it, as I recall, and when I put in the bill every year,